

REMARKS--General

In order to better understand the basic differences between Ransil and this instant application an easy way is to simply lay Ransil's invention on its side so that first element 26 is horizontal and corresponds to brace 18 of this application. Connecting link elements 30 and 32 of Ransil correspond to cantilever arm 12 of this application. Viewed as such one can see that the cantilever arm 12 of this application has a fulcrum point and continues beyond brace 18 so that biasing means 20 acts on the leverage part of the brace 18. This is a major difference since the pistons 18 and 42 of Ransil act within a zone that would correspond to being between the cantilever arm 12 and upper oblong member 14 and brace 18.

Except for the fact that both inventions appear to be concerned with the lifting of a tabletop the means used are very different.

Claim 5 states that « said pair of cantilever arms being further rotationally engaging a brace fixedly attached to said piece of furniture » there are no braces fixedly attached to a piece of furniture in Ransil since the first element is the piece of furniture itself and, moreover, there is no fulcrum involved in the cantilevering of the type illustrated in this instant application. Also, still according to claim 5, « a biasing means connecting one point of said brace to one point of said lower oblong piece » indicates that the point of attachment of the biasing means does not correspond with how the biasing means, that is the pistons, in Ransil, are connected and actuate the desired action. In view of these claim 5 sufficiently distinguishes itself over the cited prior art. As for the stoppers, in Ransil they interact with components that have no equivalent with this instant application and therefore the claim also distinguishes itself from the prior art.

Applicant hopes that he has responded to the Office Action in an appropriate manner.

Requests For Constructive Assistance

The undersigned has made a diligent effort to amend the claims of this application so that they define unobvious structure because it produces new and unexpected results. If for any reasons the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more claims pursuant to MPEP 707.07(j) or in making constructive suggestions pursuant to MPEP 706.03(d) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very Respectfully,

Guy Carpentier
Guy Carpentier

Applicant pro se